

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

THORNTON MILLER,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,

*Defendant.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 3:17-CV-03472-X-BT

Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND**  
**RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES**  
**MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After reviewing *de novo* all relevant matters of record in this case, including the *Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation* [Doc. No. 85] of the United States Magistrate Judge and plaintiff Thornton Miller's *Objection* [Doc. No. 88], in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the undersigned District Judge is of the opinion that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court.


The Magistrate Judge found and concluded that defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (Wells Fargo) is entitled to summary judgment on Miller's Title VII and Section 1981 discrimination claims and on Miller's Title VII retaliation claims. For Miller's Title VII and Section 1981 claims, the Magistrate Judge found that Miller cited no evidence in the record to support his allegation that similarly situated individuals outside of his protected class were treated differently than he was treated. For Miller's Title VII retaliation claims, the Magistrate Judge found that Miller did not

assert any protected activity to form the basis of a Title VII retaliation claim. And, even if he had done so, Miller also failed to point to evidence that established a causal connection between such protected activity and an alleged adverse employment action.

Miller responded to the Magistrate Judge's *Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation* with an objection. But, in it, Miller did not offer a specific objection to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's order. Miller mostly restated his arguments in opposition to Wells Fargo's motion for summary judgment. In his objection, Miller did correct some of the citations to his exhibits. But Miller still failed to point to specific evidence in the record to support his allegations in any way that would warrant a finding in his favor.

Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** Wells Fargo's *Motion for Summary Judgment* [Doc. No. 65]. By separate judgment, the Court will **DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE** Miller's claims against Wells Fargo.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 24th day of March 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brantley Starr", is written over a horizontal line.

BRANTLEY STARR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE